

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
NORTHERN DIVISION

LARRY DARNELL JONES,

Plaintiff,

v.

Case No. 2:04-cv-265  
HON. GORDON J. QUIST

LARRY CARLYON, M.D., et al.,

Defendants.

\_\_\_\_\_/

**OPINION AND ORDER APPROVING MAGISTRATE JUDGE'S  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation filed by the United States Magistrate Judge in this action on January 18, 2008. The Report and Recommendation was duly served on the parties. The Court has received objections from plaintiff. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court has performed *de novo* consideration of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objection has been made. The Court now finds the objections to be without merit.

Plaintiff has failed to show that defendant Carlyon violated his Eighth Amendment rights. Plaintiff has received consistent medical care and he cannot show that defendant Carlyon violated either his Eighth Amendment or First Amendment rights.

THEREFORE, IT IS ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Docket #220) is approved and adopted as the opinion of the Court.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that an appeal of this action would not be in good faith within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(3). *See McGore v. Wrigglesworth*, 114 F.3d 601, 611 (6th Cir. 1997). For the same reasons that the court grants defendant's motion for summary

judgment, the court can discern no good-faith basis for an appeal. Should the plaintiff appeal this decision, the court will assess the \$455 appellate filing fee pursuant to § 1915(b)(1), *see McGore*, 114 F.3d at 610-11, unless plaintiff is barred from proceeding *in forma pauperis*, e.g., by the “three-strikes” rule of § 1915(g). If he is barred, Plaintiff will be required to pay the \$455 appellate filing fee in one lump sum.

Dated: March 26, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Gordon J. Quist  
GORDON J. QUIST  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE